

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,520	03/17/2004	Andrew Fraser	040225-000000US 5488	
20350 TOWNSEND A	7590 01/10/200 AND TOWNSEND AN	EXAMINER		
TWO EMBAR	CADERO CENTER	OMOSEWO, OLUBUSOLA		
EIGHTH FLOO SAN FRANCIS	SCO, CA 94111-3834	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2168	•
		•	<u> </u>	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

					//
•		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)	
·		10/803,5	20	FRASER ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examine	r	Art Unit	
			OLA OMOSEWO	2168	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun	ication appears on th	e cover sheet with the c	correspondence addres	is
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M nsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comr p period for reply is specified above, the maximum st re to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months: ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IAILING DATE OF T of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no en nunication, atutory period will apply and v will, by statute, cause the ap	HIS COMMUNICATION vent, however, may a reply be tin will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from plication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this commu (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		•			
2a)	Responsive to communication(s) file This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the practi	2b)⊠ This action is a for allowance excep	non-final. t for formal matters, pro		erits is
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1,6-8,10-21 and 24-28 is/a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,6-8,10-21 and 24-28 is/a Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict	re withdrawn from co	onsideration.		
	on Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the The drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objected the oath or declaration is objected to	a) accepted or b ction to the drawing(s) the correction is requi	be held in abeyance. Sered if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1	
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority 2. Certified copies of the priority 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation	documents have be documents have be of the priority documental Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in Applicat ents have been receive lle 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Sta	ge
2) Notice 3) Information	et(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) cer No(s)/Mail Date	PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

Detailed Action

Response to Amendment

- 1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 10/16/2007.
- 2. Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 16 have been amended. Claims 2-5, 9 and 22-23 have been cancelled. Claims 25-28 are new.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
- A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1, 6-8, 10-21 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boe et al. (Patent No. U.S. 6,236,975).

For claim 1, Boe teaches "a data management system for identifying patterns in data related to an item, the system comprising a host computer having a construct repository configured to retain a plurality of construct pair reference sets, each construct pair

10/803,520

Art Unit: 2168

reference set comprising at least a first descriptive term and a second descriptive term, the first descriptive term and second descriptive term selected according to personal construct theory to represent contrasting Opinions pertaining to an aspect of the item (Col. 9, lines30-48);

a graphical user interface configured to display a user-selectable control related to a construct pair reference set of the plurality of construct pair reference sets and further configured to receive a user's opinion about the aspect of the item selected between the first descriptive term and the second descriptive term, the graphical user interface further configured to store in the construct repository the received user opinion for the construct pair reference set (Col. 12, lines 62-Col. 13, lines 1-19); and an analysis engine configured to analyze relationships among a plurality of received user opinions for construct pair reference sets retrieved from the construct in which the analysis engine analyses responses made by the user using a statistically based process to generate a recommendation for the user related to the item (Col. 2, lines 60-Col. 3, lines 42, Col. 6, lines 29-67, Col. 9, lines 30-48).

For claim 3, Boe teaches "each construct includes two distinct descriptive terms relating to things provided to users by operators of the system" (Col.12, lines 62-Col. 13, lines19)

For claim 4, Boe teaches "descriptive terms of each construct represent contrasting opinions of the thing" (Col.12, lines 62-Col. 13, lines 19, Col. 16, lines 24-43)

10/803,520

Art Unit: 2168

For claim 5, Boe teaches "which obtains data from a user that represents a user's opinion of the thing in a range defined by the descriptive terms" (Col. 5, lines 1-9)

For claim 6, Boe teaches "in which the graphical user interface is configured to receive the user's opinion about the item in a number of discrete selectable steps within a range between the first descriptive term and the second descriptive term, that number of steps being referred to as a mesh" (Col. 3, lines 23-34, Col. 12, lines 62-Col. 13, lines 19)

For claim 7, Boe teaches "further comprising a graphical user interface is configured to receive the user's opinion about the item in a number of discrete selectable steps within a range between the first descriptive term and the second descriptive term, that number of steps being referred to as a "mesh" and in which the mesh is adjusted in reaction to inputs made by users" (Col. 3, lines 23-34, Col. 12, lines 62-Col. 13, lines 19)

For claim 8, Boe teaches "in which the mesh is iteratively reduced until a minimum mesh value that yields a meaningful result is identified" (Col. 10, lines 34-66)

For claim 10, Boe teaches "in which the user can input a value representative of their opinion by adjustment of the position of a control provided by the graphical user interface" (Col. 10, lines 34-50)

10/803,520 Art Unit: 2168

For claim 11, Boe teaches "in which the results of the analysis are further used to deduce a set of information items of interest to a particular user" (Col. 6, lines 29-67)

For claim 12, Boe teaches "in which the system executes on a server that communicates with a user over a network link" (Col. 8, lines 32-53)

For claim 13, Boe teaches "a user data input component that executes on a remote host system" (Col. 4, lines 1-30)

For claim 14, Boe teaches "in which the data input component is represented in the display generated by a web browser" (Col. 10, lines 9-67)

For claim 15, Boe teaches "in which the data input component is generated by an applet that is downloaded to the remote host from the server" (Col. 3, lines 44-Col. 4, lines 24)

For claim 16, Boe teaches "in which the construct pair reference set is obtained through use of a repertory grid in accordance with personal construct theory" (Col. 4, lines 39-60, Col. 9, lines 30-48)

For claim 17, Boe teaches "in which incomplete data is processed by matching those parts of the data that are present with characteristics of existing data" (Col. 13, lines 1-58)

10/803,520

Art Unit: 2168

For claim 18, Boe teaches "in which the incomplete data is subject to discriminant analysis" (Col. 13, lines 1-58)

For claim 19, Boe teaches "in which data is subject to a process of linearisation prior to its being analysed" (Col. 5, lines 4-30)

For claim 20, Boe teaches "in which the process of linearisation includes conversion of non-numeric data to a numeric form" (Col. 3, lines 15-22)

For claim 21, Boe teaches "in which users are the customers of a business and the output includes predictive information as to the future purchasing behaviour of the customers" (Col. 12, lines 62-67, Col. 13, lines 1-19)

For claim 24, Boe teaches "a network server system operative to serve web pages to remote clients comprising a web server for generating HTML code to be rendered on a remote browser and an analysis server that implements a data management system according to claim 1, the data management system deriving input data from analysis of a user's interaction with one or more rendered web pages" (Col. 4, lines 25-60)

For claim 25, Boe teaches "A data management system for identifying patterns in data related to an item, the system comprising a host computer system having an analysis

10/803,520 Art Unit: 2168

engine configured to analyze relationships among a plurality of opinions made by a user by executing a fuzzy entailment process that:

retrieves from a construct repository a plurality of user rankings for a plurality of construct pair reference sets, each construct pair reference set comprising at least two descriptive terms that represent contrasting user opinions regarding aspects of the item; produces a first set of entailment values by determining statistically how constructs within the plurality of user rankings relate to themselves(Col. 2,lines 60-Col. 3, lines 40); produces a second set of entailment values by determining statistically how rankings of the plurality of user rankings relate to themselves (Col. 2,lines 60-Col. 3, lines 42); and compares the first set of entailment values to the second set of entailment values using a statistically-based process to identify a plurality of dynamic groups of related users, determine for a given user a selected dynamic group of the plurality of dynamic groups having a stronger bond to the user than other dynamic groups of the plurality of dynamic groups, and using behaviors of the selected dynamic group to generate a recommendation for the user related to the item"(Col. 2, lines 60-Col. 3, lines 42, Col. 6, lines 29-67, Col. 9, lines 30-48).

For claim 26, Boe teaches" analyze relationships among a plurality of received user opinions for construct pair reference sets retrieved from the construct repository in which the analysis engine analyses responses made by the user using a statistically-based process to generate a recommendation for the user related to the item (Col. 2, lines 60-Col. 3, lines 42, Col. 6, lines 29-67, Col. 9, lines 30-48);

10/803.520

Art Unit: 2168

determine the actual user behavior related to the item (Col. 2, lines 60-Col. 3, lines 42); compare the recommendation of the statistically-based process against the actual user behavior related to the item to make adjustments to the statistically-based process aimed to improve its accuracy with respect to the item for the user" (Col. 12, lines 62-Col. 13, lines 19, Col. 16, lines 24-43).

For claim 27, Boe teaches "in which the item is selected from one of a person, a product, a service, a topic, a concept, an event, and an experience" (Col. 9, lines30-48)

For claim 28 Boe teaches "wherein the user-selectable control is configured to have a discrete number of settings for receiving the user's opinion about the aspect of the item" (Col. 3, lines 23-34, Col. 12, lines 62-Col. 13, lines 19)

Response to Argument

Applicant's argument filed October 16, 2007 has been fully considered but they 5. are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully traverses applicant's arguments. As per claim 1, applicant argued that Boe does not teach "selecting construct pair reference sets comprised of contracting descriptive terms pertaining to aspects of an item, and the contrasting descriptive terms have been selected according to personal

10/803.520

Art Unit: 2168

construct theory". However, similar to applicant's example of the determination of a user's perception related to personal computer using a survey, Boe also teaches a determination of a user's financial goal using a survey. Boe teaches at Col. 9, lines30-48, wherein based on financial goals, there are two types of choices a customer could make; a customer may select either goals or spend options. The customer will be given the survey questions (aspect of an item)based on their selection. Boe further teaches that the customer will answer questions pertaining to the financial goals, based on the options chosen. However, after the customer has answered the questions, based on the descriptive term (IF condition) which exposes the users perception (personal construct theory), then a descriptive term (What-if) will presented to the customer according to the financial goals.

Applicant also argued that Boe does not teach using a statistical process to analyze the data that he collects from a given user against other data collected directly from that same user in order to detect patterns in the user's opinions". On the contrary Col. 4, lines 39-60 of Boe's teaches, based on a potential customer (user) response to series of survey questions; the survey system creates a demographic characterization of that particular customer (user). However, based on that specific customer's opinion received during the survey, it enables the business system to know which product or service to target to the specific customer who may be more likely to purchase that specific products or services. Thus teachings are synonymous to applicant's teachings of analyzing all the data collected from a given user to determine the specific user's opinion.

10/803,520 Art Unit: 2168

CONCLUSION

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLUBUSOLA OMOSEWO whose telephone number is 571-272-2738. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday from 10.00-6.00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TIM VO

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100 OLUBUSOLA OMOSEWO Examiner

Art Unit 2168